

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added or cancelled.

Claims 1-34 currently being amended.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-34 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claims 20, 23, 29 and 32 were objected to because of informalities noted on page 2 of the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, claims 20, 23, 29 and 32 have been amended to overcome the objections to these claims. The remaining claims have been amended to correct minor informalities found in those claims.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the final Office Action dated June 1, 2005, claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,137 to Karppanen. This rejection is traversed with respect to presently pending claims 1-34, for at least the reasons given below.

Karppanen is directed to a system in which a mobile station and a network entity exchange messages (see Figure 4b of that reference), whereby data is transmitted between the mobile station and the network entity in cleartext or enciphered mode. In the system of Karppanen, if the network entity decides to start transmitting in enciphered mode, the network entity transmits a predetermined pattern which is referred to in Karppanen as a “start cipher” command. In short, the final Office Action asserts that the mobile entity that is receiving data in cleartext mode detects the predetermined pattern of the “start cipher” command (part a), and the mobile station then starts adding ciphering block BLOCK1 to the

data it receives to get the cleartext back (part b). See column 4 and column 9 of Karppanen, for example.

The final Office Action further asserts that the presently pending claims are similar to the disclosure of Karppanen in that, with reference to Figure 4 of the present application, the digital data "5D" can be taken as a "cipher starting command" in order to cipher the data following thereto. However, although Karppanen does mention a cipher start command, it does not disclose or suggest a range of data to be ciphered, and it also does not disclose or suggest the ciphering pattern and the like.

In contrast to the above-mentioned deficiencies of Karppanen, the command shown in Figure 4 of the present application can be made variable depending on the adding condition and the adding range, whereby the data to be ciphered can be determined in various patterns and various ranges after the appearance of, for example, the data "5D." In that regard, the data "5D" in the example shown in Figure 4 of the present application is only a trigger at which the ciphering operation is started in various patterns and ranges, and thus it does not correspond in any way, shape or form to the "start cipher" command of Karppanen.

In the interest of expediting prosecution, presently pending independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the calculation unit adds predetermined calculation values to or subtracts predetermined calculation values from either all of or a portion of a predetermined number of items of digital data within a specified range and in a specified calculation pattern that follow after digital data that is determined as a result of the determination by the determination unit to form numerical values having the predetermined pattern. Such features, which are also recited in a similar manner in presently pending independent claims 4, 7, 10, 13, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29 and 32, are not disclosed or suggested by Karppanen. In particular, Karppanen does not disclose or suggest the adding or subtracting of predetermined calculation values to/from a portion of a predetermined number of digital data items within a specified range and in a specified calculation pattern, since Karppanen does not specify any such specified range or any such specified calculation pattern.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 1, 2005

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5426
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law
Registration No. 34,371

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819